4-30 P.M.

THE MYSORE PUBLIC CONVEYANCES BILL, 1960. AS PASSED BY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Motion to consider

†Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Minister for Home).—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Public Conveyances Bill, 1960, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Mysore Public Conveyances Bill, 1960, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

†Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, the Bill before the House is such an innocuous one that it does not require much effort on my part to convince this House about the desirability of making this enactment. At present, we have five laws functioning on the subject the Mysore Public Conveyances Act 1911 in erstwhile Mysore area the Bombay Public Conveyances Act 1920 in Bombay Karnatak area, the Madras Act in the Madras area the Hyderabad Act of 1956 in parts of Hyderabad area and in Coorg some of the provisions of this Act are being operated by the Municipality. So, I need hardly emphasis the necessity for a uniform bill as applicable to the entire State. The bill should have been passed long back but due to certain circumstances it could not be brought before the House. I am happy, at least now it is before the House and it will be passed without much discussion.

[Sri ALUR HANUMANTHAPPA, Chairman in the Chair]

The Bill was introduced in the Legislative Council and it was referred to a Select Committee consisting of 10 members with the Chief Minister as the Chairman and they have gone in detail and made certain suggestions and those suggestions have been accepted by the Legislative Council and it is now before this august House.

Chapter I provides for repeal of all the Acts now in force in several part of the State and the difinitions. This will automatically begin to operate in the urban areas where the different Acts were in force. Government have power to notify other areas also to bring them within the purview of the provisions of this Act. Chapter deals with Registration and numbering of public conveyances. If they do not register any vehicle and use for public conveyance, it provides for punishment also. Section 8 provides for fee for license and Section 9 provides for suspension of license by Controller for reasons mentioned therein. Section 10 provides for transfer of registry. Section 11 provides for informing change of residence etc., and provides for punishment also if that is not done Chapter III deals with Drivers' licence and badges. If licences are misused, it provides for punishments. If licences are misused there is provision for punishment. If passengers

are made to suffer any damage by driving by unlicensed drivers, then the bill fixes the responsibility on the owners of the vehicles. There is provision that drivers should have badges and the badges should be displayed in a conspicuous manner. If there is any breach of this provision, there is also provision for penalty. Penalty is also prescribed for use of counterfeit badges.

One important point is the provision for exemption to agriculturists for agricultural purposes. In that case the provisions of this measure will not apply to them.

Then Chapter IV prescribes the procedure for fare-hiring and plying for hire and it provides for fixing the maximum rates per mile. Any agreement for paying higher rates than that is not permissible and contracts for higher rates are invalid. It also provides for displaying the prescribed rates of fares and distances. There is obligation on the part of the driver to produce the same to a traveller or policeman on demand and we have provided for punishment on his failure to do so. We have also provided for maximum speed. It is also provided that a minimum quantity of luggage is permissible for the fare that a passenger pays. Then it is stated that the offences mentioned in section 36 are punishable and penalties have been prescribed for them.

In Chapter VI we have made provision for making rules for enforcing the provisions of this Bill.

Hitherto the municipalities in some cases and the police in some cases were enforcing the provisions of this measure. It is now proposed to entrust the enforcement to the police for proper enforcement. Most of the provisions here are already in force in some part or the other of the State and so it should be possible to pass this measure without any change.

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, my first reaction to this Bill was that like so many other Bills on the statute book this is also an equally non-consequential Bill the provisions of which are observed more in the breach than in performance. The Minister has not explained the detailed circumstances why this uniform legislation could not be brought forward earlier. It has taken nearly 5 years to bring it here.

The next reaction that I had was this. If I go to some village and explain the provisions of this Bill to the ryots they will be flabbergasted because even a cartman has got to obtain a licence and get a badge. The reaction of the villager to this will be very bad.

The Minister said that hereafter it is only the police who will enforce the provisions of this Bill and Municipalities will be divested of this authority. In once sense I welcome it, but in another I feel sorry for the change. In future we can fix the responsibility for non-implementation of the provisions of this measure on the policy and there will be no question of double jurisdiction. When I deal with the individual clauses I shall point out the defect of this provision also.

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

As regards registration, I do not see the reason for this proviso to section 5. You may give to the Superintendent of Police having jurisdiction to limit the number, but let the final appeal lie with Government. If the D. S. P. once takes the previous approval of Government then automatically when the matter comes up through the Departmental head there would not be any scrutiny at the Secretariat level and the Government will automatically give its approval. Suppose in a place like Bangalore, Hubli or Gadag the D. S. P. for reasons best known to himself limits the number of vehicles for which licences have got to be issued. In every case of refusal of licence, he does not record an order because you have given him the power to limit. The number of public vehicles according to his discretion. I feel that the non-limitation of the number of vehicles will be in the interests of the public because the more the number of vehicles the more the competition there would and it will be much easier for people to have public convenience facilities. Having given that power I want to know why you want the Government to give previous approval. If he has not exercised reasonable discretion in limiting the number, who is to judge whether it is judicial or not, or an order passed after exercising reasonable discretion. If 100 applications for registration are received, how is the elimination going to be made by him. He can take a decision that so far as the requirements of a city are concerned the number should be limited to 50, but out of the 100 applications how is he going to select, how is he going to admit the claim of a particular set of people and reject the claims of other set of people.

I can understand his limiting of the number of vehicles having regard to the requirements of the locality but when selection has to be made as to who should get the registration, then trouble would arise. I consider that the Government atleast at the higher levels should retain power of limitation and should have the power to decide such cases on appeal to them. He has also the power to refuse registration of vehicles of praticular description in the general interest of the public. Unless the act prescribes the qualifications or the conditions to be satisfied before a particular public conveyance can be licensed is indicated in the Bill itself, it will lead to the whims and fancies of the licensing officer having a play. I am afraid it would be imprudent to confer such wide powers on an official.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I quite appreciate the apprehension of the Hon'ble Member. But there are the rule making powers under which Government would use its powers with discretion.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In regard to clause 7 (4), I must emphatically enter into a protest against the provision for permitting human beings drawing carts, etc. In an age and in a democracy wherein the importance of the human personality and human individuality is being so much stressed, that this bill should perpetuate, in the year of

grace 1961, human beings drawing vehicles, is something that is ridiculous to the extreme. Has not the members of this august House are aware that there is a society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and are we to treat the citizens of this great country, worse than the animals. Is there no one to sympathise with the lot of our people.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Hamals and Coolies, instead of taking things on their hand, sometimes have their own push carts on which they carry goods. It is not the same as in Madras where a man pushes a man. But carrying goods in a cart pushed by a man is not so inhuman as the Hon'ble Member would make out.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is a familiar sight in some of the important towns where cycles are pedelled by individuals and cycle rikshaws pulled for hire by men. Members would have seen in a city like Bangalore itself three or four people huddled in a Rikshaw with a lot of luggage is put in it, b ing dragged by a man pushing it over the gradient under great stress and wieldness. He will be panting for breath. It is a ghastly and distressing sight and this bill wishes to perpetuate and licence it.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I quite appreciate the sentiments of the Leader of the Opposition. His view is that vehicles carrying men and drawn by men should be prohibited. Clause 7 (4) does not say anything about men being drawn by men. It only prescribes particulars to be entered into the registers. Where a cart or vehicle is u ed as a push-cart in order to carry luggage from one place to another, the particulars in respect of that cart or vehicles are to be given and entered. If it is the case of the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition that the type of vehicles he just now narrated, namely, bicycles and tricycles were men actually expert themselves in order to carry people sitting in the back, I can understand. That is no doubt an inhuman sight and if my interpretation is correct, he should make his views clear in the appropriate clause.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I do not want men to push vehicles at all. Such cases must be omitted.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—You cannot prevent it. The Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition would have seen in Tarugupet where bullock carts will not move and goods will have to be transported from one godown to another only by push carts. Sub-clause 4 does not specifically relate to vehicles drawn by men to take people from one place to another. If it is the Hon'ble Member's intention that vehicles drawn by men in order to transport men from one place to another should be prevented it should be brought under clause 5.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am coming to clause 5. I am saying that this push-cart business which is a harassment should stop. If they are not registered at all, it would be a great service rendered.

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

About clause 8 (6), I do not understand this reference to perambulators. To my knowledge, perambulators are used to carry children and I do not if they are also to be registered under the Act.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—If they are used for hire, they should be registered.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—To my knowledge there is not a single perambulator in the State which is used for hire. When an act is being passed, we ought to be realistic about it. The word "perambulator" is not a technical expression.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE —Supposing pushing of carts or vehicles is to be prohibited what alternative employment would the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition suggest to those who are thrown out.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My argument does not apply to the coolies in Tharagupet or in any other centre, who carry headloads or backloads that is, carrying on shoulders. The moment a vehicle is allowed to be drawn by men the weight of load that could be carried would have no limit.

Let there be a regular bullock cart ; let him be a driver ; let him get a bullock cart license.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Is it your case that vehicles pushed or drawn by men for the carrige of goods also should be prohibited ? Because in the first instance, when I heard you say that it would be inhuman to allow human beings to draw other human beings, I quite appreciate and there is a lot of force in your arguments , but is it your case that people should be prohibited from using human labour to push carts or draw carts for the carriage of goods ? Because in many of the places like goods shed area, and railway stations push carts will to be used in order to lessen the burden of men and on account or space also, we have got to use human labour. I can appreciate your first point. I will bestow my attention on it ; but in regard to the second point, I hope you will not press.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I agree up to a limit human labour cannot be eliminated in goods traffic but if even a single man sits in cart, it is most inhuman sight. Society has to assert itself. In regard to most of these matters, it is public opinion that must assert itself. I agree that we cannot altogether eliminate in regard to use of human labour up to a limit. But supposing a bullock-cart which is normally drawn by a pair of bullocks is utilized by a single individual when it is fully loaded. This sight also is not uncommon in a city like Bangalore. The man is the owner of a bullock-cart. For some reason. the bullock may die or he may not be in a position to replace the bullock or it is a bullock which has got to go to pinjira pole. During the intervening period he substitutes himself in place of the bull and does the work of the bull. Would you allow a thing like

that to happen ? I do not know whether there is any provision. in the Police Act by which he can be hauled up. I want you to consider that matter. The perambulator business will have to be taken out of clause (*f*).

Coming to Clause 14.

"Upon the registration of any public conveyance the Controller shall cause to be painted on some conspicuous part of the conveyance its number in the register....."

Clause 15 is a penalty Clause. This is likely to lead to a lot of harassment

"If any public conveyance stands or plies for hire without a legible inscription as prescribed by section. 14, the owner thereof shall, on conviction, be punishable with fine which may extend to twenty rupees."

Who is to determine whether a particular inscription is legible ? It is a question of assessing the degree of illegibility or obliteration. I know a few policemen are out to harass particularly villagers. When a man comes within the town limit, anything is possible for the policemen to harass him.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The idea of enforcing this law is mostly in urban areas. That is why Government have retained the power to either remove the enforcement of the provision of this Act in a particular area or if found necessary, to extend it to other places. It is not the idea to enforce these things in all the villages. It is mostly in Bangalore, Mysore and other places where it is found necessary to enforce this law.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—But why not make the position clear that this Bill has exclusive jurisdiction only as applied to cities, towns or municipalities having a certain population. You have got the power under Clauses 2 and 3 to define or notify the area, but if it is the intention of Government not to extend this to rural areas, it will be a great relief to everybody concerned.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—For the time being we have no such idea. It is intended to enforce the law only in urban areas. If there is need in a particular area, then we can notify it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—So far as Clauses 14 and 15 are concerned, the degree of illegibility or legibility or obliteration is a matter which has given rise to a lot of difficulty and complication and harassment to people. Take for exemple jutkawalas. I have no sympathy with them as a class. Supposing there is an honest jutkawala who has respect for authority, who wants to abide by any law that may be promulgated. You have not fixed the duration so far as the numbering and the figure of certain distance, speed, luggage and all that are concerned. You have not fixed definite time, that it is current for six month or one year. Supposing when it is less than the period it becomes illegible. What is to happen to such things ?

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

So far as penalty for plying for hire without legible inscription is concerned, no period is prescribed.

> "If any public conveyance stands or plies for hire without a legisible inscription as prescribed by section 14, the owner thereof shall, on conviction, be....."

What is prescribed in section 14 is that it should be legible. Supposing even after ten days after the thing it is painted, becomes illegible.

In regard to sub-section (4) of clause 16 so far as the grant of driver's licence is concerned.

> "The Controller may refuse to grant a licence to any person if in his opinion such person is not competent and careful or is unfit on account of infirmity, bad character or any other reason to pursue the occupation of driver of a public conveyance."

This is a very omnibus provision. The Controller can subject the person to certain rigorous tests and find out whether he is competent or not. Also when the person drives, Controller will find out whether he is not careful. He will find out if the person is a bad character. His antecedents will be traced.

Sir, so far as the choice of profession is concerned, we are in a free country and it is open to me to choose any profession in which I have an aptitude. I have the necessary facilities and a liking. No Officer or the Controller can refuse to issue a license to me and register my name to take up a particular occupation. All the other words are all right but "any other reason to pursue the occupation" must be deleted.

Clause 19 is: "The Controller may suspend for such period as he thinks fit the licence of the driver of a public conveyance whenever in his opinion such driver is unfit to be so employed."

It looks so whimsical. The Controller who has gone into the case thoroughly and come to the conclusion that the driver is fit and issued a lincence, cannot at any time suspend the licence. That leads to the impression that he can deal it with a whimsical manner. It is not uncommon, as the Hon'ble Minister also knows, that the police officers commandeer in times of need or for any other reason, these vehicles. Probably, the Minister may have an idea that the entire police force is of an exemplary nature.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have not said it at any time.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Even if you have that idea, there is nothing wrong because you are in charge of the department. What I say is, the Controller issues the licence after going into the full details of the case. The man who has to grant the license has the power to withdraw no doubt. But, how can he suspend without giving notice to

the concerned person ? This has happened in the case of a large number of motor drivers. Supposing a man refuses to bring is motor car for his personal use for the days he wanted. Supposiong a particular officer wanted the use of a particular vehicles and the use of the driver's energy and labour for a particular period ; he may say, his licence is suspended. My point is, Section 19 should be differently worded. I do not want to say anything more than that. Coming to the question of Driver's Badge, if you insist on this illegitimate objection, cases would mount up as in the case of prohibition cases.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Supposing a driver puts somebody who is not experienced to drive the vehicle. If the vehicle is driven by that man and if something happens, you will blame us. If there is an alternative, I welcome it.

Sri J. B MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I must admit, I have not thought of an alternative. But the point is, a man who is honest about it and the badge wears off due to lapse of time, the difficulty comes. On the mere ground that an inscription of a particular badge is not legible, he will be booked. In the Police Department what happens is, each police man has to took certain number of cases every month.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—No ; no such is prescribed.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Very well Sir. You very rightly emphasised that Section 29 is an important Section in this bill because it refers to agriculturists and a kind of exemption is made to them. But, it would be difficult to Government as to how to determine whether a particular bullock cart or category of carts swere used to agriculture. Supposing I am an agriculturist and I have two pairs of bullocks and two carts. During the off season, I utilise it for hiring purposes. My cart is not licenced for the simple reason that I have the exemption.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Hiring does not mean agriculture.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That is the question I am asking. How are you going to determine ?

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—This exemption will cover only the agriculture operations and not transporting agricultural produce from one village to another.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You have not specified what is agriculture, whether it is transport of manure or whether it is a question of transport of harvested produce to the house ; you have not mentioned. Supposing I am the owner and I have few servants who use the cart without my permission for a purpose which is not strictly agriculture ; then what are you going to do ? I am all out with the Government to make things easy to the agriculturist. But, what are the preventive measures that you propose to adopt to prevent the misuse of the Act ? That is the point to which the Hon'ble Minister may apply his mind.

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

Then, coming to the maximum fares for use of public conveyances and prohibition of back fare, I have to refer in this connection, however regretfully and painfully, to the part played by Jutkawalas in some of the centres. They have become a public nuisance. In sub-clause (2) it is said :

> "No owner or driver shall demand or receive in excess of the said fare any sum for back for the return of the vehicle from the place at which it was discharged".

Sir, this is a thing which is being freely indulged by the Motor Cycle Rickshaws and Rickshaws and jutkas.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Even the Government does it. If you use the Legislator' Home car to go to railway station, they charge the back fare from railway station to Legislators' Home. Why do you accuse the rickshawalas. The Government itself is criminal.

Sri H. M CHANNABASAPPA —Sir, with all deference to Sri Muckannappa, I appeal to him, at least let him be kind in words. (*laughter*).

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In this particular case there were two ladies and children who happened to be innmates of this jutka. It was a very distressing situation. I have often made attempts to extricate some of these people from this difficult situation. The point is, the train comes to the Bangalore City Station at 9-30 in the night. Naturally the number of jutkas in the stand will be limited. Poor ladies and children, if they have to go to distant places like Basavanagudi or Jayanagar, you could imagine their plight. I tell you the whole people of a locality should cluster round the jutkawala to satisfy the claims of this fellow and he misbehaves. I would not have appealed to the Hon'ble Minister if it were a stray incident. But it has become the general pattern and women and children are the worst affected in this.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I would like to agree with what Mr. Mallaradhya says. Government has absolutely no mercy for these people. If this remedy provided in clause 30 is not sufficient, I will be prepared to accept any measure which will bring about the desired effect. Let him think over it and let other Hon'ble Members also think over this, as to what is to be done in order to prevent this.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I will take only ten minutes more Sir. In regard to this sub-section (3) of section 32.

> "(3) The driver of every public conveyance standing or plying for hire shall have with him a copy of such list and table and shall on demand produce the same for the inspection of any police officer or the information of any hirer or passenger, of his carriage."

In addition to this, why is it that these cannot be prominantly displayed on the vehicle ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have no objection to accept any amendment in this behalf.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.— In Calcutta, they have this kind details displayed on the vehicle itself. You must kindly see that this is displayed.

My observation about the inhuman treatment of manual labour to this provision. What does this mean ? If you will please see item (*f*) of clause 8 which says:

> (*f*) For every perambulator or other vehicle drawn or pushed by man in any other manner.

That means, you will allow a man to take it for 3 miles or 6 miles. Sir, I personally feel that this section should be eliminated having regard to considerations which I mentioned.

In clause 33, you speak of speed. Of course, in the case of motor vehicles, there is a speedometer. In regard to other types of vehicles, what is the control and check ? How are you going to determine the speed ? The police officer will have to use his discretion.

Another thing is, you have made the position of the Magistrate also rather difficult. Any decision in these cases will be by courts. What are the governing conditions for the magistrate to come to a decision ? You put up a case against the owner or the driver of a vehicle that he overspeeded. What is the evidence that has got to be produced in a court of Law and what has the Magistrate to do ? If he is a magistrate who wants to win the affection and esteem of the police, he must give conviction. Presumption of offence is always against the man who is produced before the court by the police. My friend Sri. Kothawale knows that when a petty offence is produced before magistrate, the presumption is always against him. They are made to admit. Supposing the magistrate is a man with conscience; I do not think he can agree with any case and give judgement. If the man admits, it is his funeral. But if a lawyer takes up his case, how is the magistrate to convict ?

The next question is in regard to penalties imposed. The variety of offences are mentioned. (*a*) refers to a driver who is drunk during his employment. Is it a case of continuing offence ? Suppose I as a driver take drinks half an hour before I actually begin to drive, is he going to be considered to have drunk during his employment ? Is he to be hauled up for being drunk in the discharge of his duties or is it because that he was employed, as a driver during his employment.

About imprisonment, I should like to ask, do the offences under this Act warrant imprisonment at all. This is a matter which I would like the Hon'ble Minister to kindly examine and come to a decision

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

before the House votes on this particular clause. I have not been able to send up an amendment in respect of this clause. But I would honestly suggest that we omit this provision in regard to impirsonment. You may, if you so disire, increa e the amount of fine.

Coming to clause 37. here is a case in which the limb of the law has displayed the helplessness of the State.

5-30 P.M.

Speakig from personal experience there was no difficulty to get motor car drivers till 25 years ago, but for the last 8 to 10 years it is difficult to get drivers who will stick up for more than 3 to 6 months, It is also very difficult to get the address of the driver. If the summons issued against the driver is not obeyed, is there no legal pocedure to enforce attendance of the driver? What is the point in making the owner responsible for it? Is it difficult for tne police to identify the driver of a particular vehicle because in the register you maintain his antecedents, etc.

Sub-section (3) says that if the owner fails without reasonable excuse to appear such driver on a second or subsequent summons requiring him to do so, the magistrate may dispose of the complaint in the absence of the owner and driver or either of them.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಷ್ಟವಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ನಮಗೂ ಸಹಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸಮನ್ ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಿಂಸೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮ್ಯಾಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟರು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರ ಏನಿದೆ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You must enforce attendance or make a penal offence.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ:—ಧಾರವಾಡ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿಯ ಒಂದು ಕೇಸು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರಬಹುದು ಆಸಾಮಿ ಪತ್ತೆಯಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಕೇಸಿಗೊಸ್ಕರ ಆಸಾಮಿ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಎತ್ಯಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಡಿಸಿಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಬಿಟ್ಟರು ಇದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರಬಹುದು.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Suppose in the absence of the owner and the driver the Magistrate comes to a decision and fines, do you mean to say that at the time of recovery of the fine he is not going to be traced? The dignity and the prestige of magistracy will be lowered by this provision. Is it that the Magistrate is so helpless that he cannot secure the attendance of a petty driver before him?

Then section 39 says: "If any person who had hired a public conveyance refuses to pay to the owner or driver thereof the fare payable under this Act, the magistrate may order payment of such fare, and also of reasonable compensation for loss of time, and in default of immediate payment, such fare and compensation may be recovered as a fine." You have not introduced the system of issuing receipts for hire charges paid. If a recalcitrant jutkawala says that he has not been paid his fare, what is going to happen? Any conscientious magistrat

would find it difficult to function under this. Then sub-clause (2) says: "If any person who has used any such vehicle attempts to evade payment of the legal fare. or any portion thereof, he shall, on conviction, be punishable with fine which may extend to fifty rupees in addition to any payment which may have been ordered under sub-section (1)." Instead of "legal fare" it should have been "prescribed fare".

Then I want to know whether there is any justification for clause 41. What is the class of cases the Home Minister had in view when framed this clause? If I sit in a jutka what is the kind of wilful injury that I can cause? I have not been able to understand the purpose of this clause.

Then in clause 42 you say that the Controller shall appoint sufficient number of public stands for public conveyances. Instead of "appoint" it should have been "fix". Similarly in sub-clause (2) also it should be "fixed" instead of appointed.

Then coming to clause 45, do you contemplate even substituted service? Normally you know how process servers serve summons. Simply some two fellows put their signature and the summons is treated as served. I want you to strengthen the hands of the magistrate to instal fear of law in the minds of people.

This sub-clause 2 of clause 46 is not clear to me. That means that the law of limitation does not operate in criminal cases. If the man does not make a complaint within 30 days, cognizance would not be taken of the case at all. Clause 46(2) it therefore unnecessary. There is no point in saying that it is a continuing offence.

About the power to arrest without a warrant, the whole scheme of this Bill is to eliminate the possibility of issuing a warrant by a magistrate. When the magistrate himself is prevented thus, a provision is being made for a police officer to arrest without a warrant. Of what rank would the police officer be? We have always complained that this power of arresting without a warrant is being misused by the generality of the police. If the status of the arresting police officer is not mentioned, a constable can arrest, if he is in uniform. What are the circumstances under which the arrest can be made? That is not mentioned here. Mere process serving is not enough. If a person could not be served with the summons what reason is there for the police officer to say that he would avoid the summons. Unusual power is being given to the police officer.

Coming lastly to the financial memorandum. It is estimated that the total expenditure on account of enforcement of the Bill would be Rs. 1,00,000. If it is the intention to just satisfy a technical requirement, I have no objection but the margin of error should not be too great.

With these words, I commend the Bill and I am sure the Hon'ble Minister for Home would meet the several points raised. Atleast he is

(Sri J. B. MALLABADHYA)

one of those Ministers who have made a note of our arguments and whether he is convincing or not he would atleast make a mention of them.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೆ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡಮೇಲೆ ಇಂಥ ಅತಿಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜನರನ್ನು ಸಿಕ್ಕಿನಚಾರದ ಇಕ್ಕಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಸಿ ಆ ಜನರ ಆಗಚಾಟಲನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಸಂತೋಷ ಪಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ತಾವಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಚೆನ್ನಬಸವನವರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರಿಲ್ಲ ಇಂಥ ದಕ್ಷರು ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ ಇವರು ಸುಖೀ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಆಗಬೇಕು– ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜನರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಸುಖವಿಂದಿರಬೇಕು, ಯಾರೂ ಕಷ್ಟಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಬಾರದು ಎಂಬ ಸೋಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾವ್ಯಾವ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಶಾಸನ ಕಡಿತಕ್ಕೆ ರೀಸಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅಂಥ ಶಾಸನಗಳಿಂದ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಿರುಕುಳ ಕಷ್ಟನಷ್ಟಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡುವುಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಈಗತಾನೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆಂದರೆ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಹೊಸ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಐದು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ದೇಶಗಳ ಭಾಗಗಳು ಸೇರಿ ಒಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಈ ಐದು ಭಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ರೀತಿ ಶಾಸನಗಳು ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಒಂದು ಸಮನ್ವಯಗೊಳಿಸಲು ಈಗ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೇಗೆ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಸಮನ್ವಯಗೊಳಿಸಬೇಕು, ಜನರ ಕಲ್ಯಾಣ ಸಾಧಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಏಕೆ ಅಂಥ ಜನಾನುಕೂಲವಾದ ಬಿರ್ಗಳನ್ನು ತರಲು ಹಿಂಜರಿದು ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಹೀಗೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಯಾವ ಬಿರ್ಗಳು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೋ ಅಂಥವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದರೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾನೂನಿನ್ನಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರ ಮರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಕೆಳಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅದಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡಿಸಿ, ಆ ಮೂಲಕ ಜನಗಳಿಗಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಕೀಟ್ಲೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಸಂತೋಷಪಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಸೆ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲಕ್ಕಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಈ ಅಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷ ಸುಖೀ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಮಾತು ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ದೂರವಾದ ಮಾತು. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸುದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಆರೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಾಯಕರು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲೂ ಅಡಗಿದ್ದ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಇಂಥ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳಿಂದ ಹಳ್ಳಿ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕಷ್ಟ ಕಾರ್ಪಣ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುವುದೇ ವಿನಾ ಇದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೇನೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂತ ಆಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಆ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೆಲೆಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಮತ್ತೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕಾಲಂನಲ್ಲೂ ಏನೇನು ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಒಂದು ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮರೆತು ಕೇವಲ ಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದಷ್ಟೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಧಿಕ ರಾಜ್ಯವನ್ನು ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯವನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ರಾಜ್ಯವನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಲು ಹೊರಟಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಬಿರ್ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ 2½ ಕೋಟಿ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆ ತರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಿರ್ ಶಾಸನ ಕಡಿತಕ್ಕೇರಿದ್ದೇ ಆದರೆ ಜನರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಯುಂದ ಬಾಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ನಿಮಿಷದಲ್ಲೂ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರ

ದಾರ್ಜನ್ಯ ದಬ್ಬಾಳಿಕೆ ನಿಕ್ಕ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲ ಸಾಧಿಸಿದ್ದ ಅಷ್ಟಿಷ್ಟು ನಾಗರೀಕತೆ ಇದು ಮಣ್ಣುಪಾಲಾಗುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಂದಮ್ಮಗಳು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶಾದ್ ತಪನ್ನು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲುರತಕ್ಕ ಎರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳು ನಡೆಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನೀಗ ನಾವು ಗೌರ್ನರ್ ಮುಖಕ ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.– Enforcing agency ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಆಗಬಹುದು ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಆಗಬಹುದು. ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಜೇಡವೆಂದರೆ ಬೇರೆಯಾರ ಕೈಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡೋಣವೆಂಬುನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗೆ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಖಾತೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ರುಜು ಹಾಕಲು ಬರದೆ ಇರುವ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟೇಬಲ್‌ಗಳ ಕೈಗೆ, ರಾಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡುವ ತಾವು, ನಾಗರೀಕರನ್ನುವ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಜನರನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹಿಂಸೆ ಪಡಿಸಬೇಡಿ. ಪಾನನಿರೋಧ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲು ಬೇರೆ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಪಡೆಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸುತ್ತೆವೆ. ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾದ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಪಡೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತೆವೆಂದು ತಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾರ್ಕ ರಾಜಯ್ಯನವರೂ, ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾರ್ಕ ಜಟ್ಟಯ್ಯನವರೂ, ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾರ್ಕ ಪುಣಚ್ಚನವರೂ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I want to remove some misapprehension in the mind of the Honourable Member. I remember very clearly that the Excise Minister and also myself have made a categorical statement that we are not going to entrust the work of enforcing prohibition to any other agency except Police in the present circumstances. The Honourable Member is not correct in saying that we made an assurance that we are going to have a different agency for that.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆವ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕರಾಪಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆ ಏನು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾಳೆ ದಿವಸ ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡಲು ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರಗಳ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳ ಮೇಲಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಯ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಮೇಲಿನ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಯ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ತೆಗೆದುತೋರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ socialistic pattern of society ಬರಬೇಕು dignity of labour ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ವೇದಿಕೆಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಂತು ಕೂಡು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಹದಿನೆಂಟನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಂತೆಯೇ, ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಜನ ಬಾಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವಂತೆ ಈ ಎಫೆಯಿಕದಿಂದ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನತರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕುದುರೆ ಗಾಡಿ ಇರುವಂಥ ಕಡೆ ಮನುಷ್ಯನು ಎಳೆಯುವ ಗಾಡಿಗೆ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಮನುಷ್ಯನನ್ನು ಮೃಗವನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ನಾಗರೀಕರು ಬಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗತಕ್ಕ ಗಾಡಿಗೆ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. Definitions ನಲ್ಲಿ "driving" includes dragging or pushing and "driver" includes any person who drives, drags, or pushes any public Conveyance ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ 8 (*f*) ನಲ್ಲಿ For every perambulator or other vehicle drawn or pushed by man or in any other manner. –Rs. 1-50 ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಫೀ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿವ್ರೀರಿ. ಒಂದು ಗಾಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಕುಳಿತು ಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಎಳೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ಹೊಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅಂಥದಕ್ಕೆ ಪರವಾನಗಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀವೆಂದು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಫೀಸ್ ಮಾತ್ರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೊರಟಿರುವ ನೀವು ಮಾನವನಿಗೆ ಇರುವ ಆತ್ಮ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವ ಹಾದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ.... ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಧೋರಣೆ ಏನು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

"ಕಣ್ಣಿದ್ದೂ ಕುರುಡರಯ್ಯ, ಕಾರದ್ದೂ ಕುಂಟರಯ್ಯ, ಕಿವಿಯಿದ್ದರೂ ಕಿವುಡರಯ್ಯ..."

ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ, ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬನ ಮೇಲೆ ಕುಳಿತು ಮಜಾ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬೆವರುಸುರಿಸಿ ಗಾಡಿಯನ್ನು ಎಳೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವವನನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಸುಖ ಪಡತಕ್ಕ ಜನ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸುಖೀ ರಾಜ್ಯವನ್ನು ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಬಲ್ಲರಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇವರೆಲ್ಲ ಮನುಷ್ಯರು, ಬೇರೆ ಜನ ಎಳೆಯುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿಜ, ಬೇರೆ ಜನ ಎಳೆದರೆ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಾಪವನು ನ್ಯರ್ಗಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾನೆ ಅಥವಾ ನರಕದ ಬಾಗಿಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಬಾಗಿಲು ತಟ್ಟುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಅವಕ್ಕೊಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಾತ್ತವಾದ ಧೇಯಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರೇ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ತಾವು ತರಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತರುವ ಮುಂಚೆ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗಲಾದರೂ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ಇಂಥ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಶಾಸನಕಡಿತಕೆ ಏರಿಸಿ.

ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯ ಬಂದರೂ, ಮದ್ರಾಸ್, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ, ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ, ಗುಜರಾತ್ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇದು ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ ಜಾಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಡಬ್ಬಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಚಿತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತ ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಇದೆ. ತಾವು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇತರ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಕತೆ ತೋರಿಸುವುದರ ಬದಲು ಇತರ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ತಾವೇ ಮಾದರಿಯಾಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡುವಾರದು. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮನುಷ್ಯರು ಎಳೆಯುವ ಗಾಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡಲೇ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The Hon'ble Member seems to have forgotten that at the time when the same remark was being made by the Opposition, I did say that the matter was worth being considered and that I would consider it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ದೇವರು ತಮಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಮಾಡಲಿ.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The Hon'ble Member will continue to-morrow We will now take up half-an-hour discussion. Sri V. S. Patil.

6-00 P.M.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION ON Q. NO. 201 REGARDING DEATHS DUE TO FOOD POISONING IN BELGAUM.

† Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, my question No. 201 related to food poisoning matter which occurred at Belgaum and in which according to the answer given by the Government, 91 persons were affected and 9 persons died. To my question whether Government have traced the causes